

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/689,767	10/20/2003	Mark Hamm	21400/0209952-US0	4545	
79292 Boston Scienti	7590 03/17/201 ific Corporation	EXAMINER			
Darby & Darb		LAMPRECHT, JOEL			
P.O. Box 770 Church Street	Station	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
New York, NY	7 10008-0770		3737		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/17/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/689,767	HAMM ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JOEL M. LAMPRECHT	3737	

	JOEL M. LAMPRECHT	3737						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 2/8/2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.							
b) A The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.076.	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee wave been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding enteron for five 1. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL								
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the filed with th	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	•							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);						
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).								
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):								
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. If or purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
/BRIAN CASLER/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3737								

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued that sensor and sensor coils are not disclosed covered with "a layer of non conductive epoxy" in the references cited. It can first be appreciated that Ben-Haim at least discloses an imaging device in a distal portion of a catheter, a sensor coupled electronically to the iamging device and proximal to the device, and that the sensor comprises coils (as described in the WO document cited in ben-haim which is also PCT/IUS1995/001103), and that the sensor at least has some sort of trace to transmit the signals. The reference to Hadjicostis discloses another catheter structure which comprises position markers in addition to an ultrasound transducer stack. The sensor of Ben-Haim is diclosed within the schematic view as having a structure formed around the sensor coils, but there are not specifics of the type of material used for this covering. Hadjicostis is used as a teaching reference due to the fact that the position element of Hadjicostis is coupled to the imaging transducers and actually is integrated into the layers of the circuitry of the ultrasound transducer. This teaching, along with the matching layer materials teaches that a position detecting element and ultrasound transducer can be incorporated into the same stack/circuitry and using coaxial cables the circuitry oan efficiently carn striansly.

The argument that Webb does not disclose a drive shaft coil surrounding a coaxial cable (that is more than 2 wires), results in the discussion of what a 'drive shaft coil' is. The specification lists a drive shaft coil as simply a conductive wire surrounding another cable or wires which forms another coil shape. The reference to Webb comprises a driving coil and optical fibers (multiple) disposed within and thereby surrounded by the cable. Webb is also of particular note due to the coil based sensor which is ultilized distal to the drive shaft and proximal of the imaging element.